

**MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES**

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.	02-CV-12084-PBS	Removed to D. Mont.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• February 8, 2007 – <b>Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment</b> (<i>individual motions filed by Abbott Laboratories, AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Bayer Corp., BMS, Immunex Corp., Johnson &amp; Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., Pfizer &amp; Pharmacia, Schering-Plough Corp. &amp; Warrick Pharmaceuticals, Sicor, Inc. and TAP Pharmaceutical Prods., Inc.</i>) (<i>individual memorandum in support of Joint Motion filed by Fujisawa</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ February 9, 2007 – Defendant AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP’s Motion for Leave to File Certain Documents Under Seal</li> <li>○ March 22, 2007 – Montana’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment</li> <li>○ April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment</li> <li>○ April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declaration of Dorothy Poulsen Submitted in Support of State of Montana’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ April 25, 2007 – Montana and Nevada’s Joint Opposition to Defendants’ Motions to Strike the Declarations of Dorothy Poulsen, Charles Duarte and Coleen Lawrence</li> <li>§ May 2, 2007 – Reply in Further Support of Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declaration of Dorothy Poulsen</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ April 26, 2007 – Montana’s Opposition to Individual Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment</li> <li>○ May 10, 2007 – Individual Defendants’ Reply in Further Support of Their Motions for Summary Judgment (<i>replies filed by AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Bayer Corp., Fujisawa, Immunex Corp., Johnson &amp; Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., Pfizer, Inc., and Schering-Plough &amp; Warrick Pharmaceuticals</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• February 8, 2007 – <b>The State of Montana’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Against Certain Defendants</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ March 22, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Opposition to the State of Montana’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Against Certain Defendants (<i>individual motions filed by Abbott, Pfizer, and Pharmacia; AstraZeneca; Aventis Behring, LLC.; Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Bayer Corp; Fujisawa; Immunex Corp.; Johnson &amp; Johnson; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.; Schering-Plough Corp. &amp; Warrick Pharmaceuticals; Sicor Inc.; TAP Pharmaceutical Prods., Inc; ZLB Behring LLC</i>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. (continued)			<p>§ March 22, 2007 – Defendant AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP’s Motion for Leave to File Certain Documents Under Seal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 8, 2007 – <b>Defendants’ Motion that Court Suggest Transfer of the Montana and Nevada Cases to Their Federal Courts of Origin (re: Montana and Nevada)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 22, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion Suggesting Transfer of Cases to Federal Courts of Origin</li> </ul> </li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Joint Motion for Dismissal of TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.</b></li> </ul>
Nevada v. American Home Products, Inc. et al (“Nevada II”)	02-CV-12086-PBS	Removed to D. Nev.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 8, 2007 – <b>Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment</b> (<i>individual motions filed by AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Immunex Corp., Johnson &amp; Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., Pfizer, Inc., Schering-Plough &amp; Warrick Pharmaceuticals and Sicor, Inc.</i>) (<i>individual memorandum in support of Joint Motion filed by Fujisawa</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>March 22, 2007 – State of Nevada’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment</li> <li>April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment</li> <li>April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declarations of Charles Duarte and Coleen Lawrence Submitted in Support of State of Nevada’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ April 25, 2007 – Montana and Nevada’s Joint Opposition to Defendants’ Motions to Strike the Declarations of Dorothy Poulsen, Charles Duarte and Coleen Lawrence</li> <li>§ May 2, 2007 – Joint Reply in Further Support of Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declarations of Charles Duarte and Coleen Lawrence</li> </ul> </li> <li>April 26, 2007 – Nevada’s Opposition to Individual Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment</li> <li>May 10, 2007 – Individual Defendants’ Replies in Further Support of Their Motions for Summary Judgment (<i>replies filed by AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Fujisawa, Immunex Corp., Johnson &amp; Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., and Schering-Plough &amp; Warrick Pharmaceuticals</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>February 8, 2007 – <b>Defendants’ Motion that Court Suggest Transfer of the Montana and Nevada Cases to Their Federal Courts of Origin (re: Montana and Nevada, see entry under Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.)</b></li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Nevada v. American Home Products, Inc. et al (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> </ul>
State of Nevada v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:06-539	n/a	Removed to D. Nev.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 28, 2006 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>State of Nevada v. Dey, Inc., et al.</i>, D. Nev., Case No. 3:06-539, to D. Mass.</li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> </ul>
California <i>ex rel.</i> Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.	03-CV-11226-PBS	Removed to C.D. Cal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January 17, 2006 – <b>Defendant ZLB Behring LLC's Individual Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>March 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant ZLB Behring, LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint</li> <li>April 3, 2006 – Reply in Support of Defendant ZLB Behring LLCs Individual Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint-in-Intervention</li> <li>April 17, 2006 – Plaintiffs' Sur-Reply to Defendants' Joint and Individual Motions to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint</li> </ul> </li> <li>February 13, 2006 – <b>Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint-In-Intervention</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 3, 2006 – Separate Reply in Support of Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint in Intervention of Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation</li> </ul> </li> <li>April 11, 2006 – <b>Notice of Proposed Case Management Order Pursuant to the Court's March 16, 2006 Ruling</b></li> <li>April 28, 2006 – <b>Stipulated Motion for Order Permitting Deposition of Harvey Weintraub</b> (former Warrick Vice President)</li> <li>July 26, 2006 – <b>Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court's Request for Claims Examples</b> (submission attached) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>August 4, 2006 – Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court's Request for Claims Examples</li> <li>September 12, 2006 – Plaintiffs' Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court's Request for Claims Examples</li> <li>October 5, 2006 – Defendants' Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Response to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court's Request for Claims</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
California <i>ex rel.</i> Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. (continued)			<p>Examples (reply attached)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> </ul>
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., Case No. 1:06-21303	n/a	S.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 11, 2006 – <b>Conditional Transfer Order</b> (30) transferring <i>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc., et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, S.D. Fla., Case No. 1:06-21303, to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 26, 2006 – No Notice of Opposition filed</li> </ul> </li> <li>January 24, 2007 – <b>Plaintiffs’ “Notice to the Court of Motion Fully Briefed”</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January 25, 2007 - Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ “Notice to the Court of Motion Fully Briefed”</li> </ul> </li> <li>March 28, 2007 – <b>Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Renewed Motion to Compel Evidence Withheld Under the Deliberative Process Privilege</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 20, 2007 - United States’ Opposition to Defendant Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Renewed Motion to Compel Evidence Withheld Under the Deliberative Process Privilege</li> <li>July 17, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Reply to United States’ Opposition to Abbott’s Renewed Motion to Compel Evidence Withheld Under the Deliberative Process Privilege</li> <li>July 17, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Reply Memorandum in Support of its Renewed Motion to Compel Evidence Withheld Under the Deliberative Process Privilege</li> </ul> </li> <li>July 17, 2007 – <b>Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss or Partially Dismiss the United States’ First Amended Complaint</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Unopposed Motion by the United States’ for Leave to File Post-Hearing Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to Abbott’s Motion to Compel Adequate Responses to Abbott’s Discovery Requests</b></li> </ul>
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 05-11084	n/a	S.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 31, 2007 – <b>Dey Defendants’ Motion to Amend the Court’s July 17, 2007 Memorandum and Order to Include a Certification of An Immediate Appeal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)</b></li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
State of Florida, et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al, Case No. 4:06-476	n/a	Removed to N.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 28, 2006 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>State of Florida, et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al</i>, N.D. Fla., Case No. 4:06-476, to D. Mass.</li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>March 12, 2007 – Response of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Florida Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notice</li> </ul> </li> <li>April 27, 2007 – <b>Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> </ul>
State of Arizona ex rel. v. Abbott Labs., Case No. 2:06-45	n/a	D. Ariz.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>August 11, 2006 – <b>Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Motion for Remand</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>August 25, 2006 – Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Motion for Remand</li> <li>October 24, 2006 – Order issued by Judge Patti B. Saris denying Motion to Remand to State Court</li> <li>October 25, 2006 – Electronic Notice from the Court to Reopen Document #2974 Motion to Remand to State Court</li> </ul> </li> <li>November 9, 2006 – <b>Defendant Dey, Inc.’s Supplemental Notice of Removal</b> (<i>leave to file granted on November 2, 2006</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 13, 2006 – Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Response to Defendant Dey, Inc.’s Supplemental Notice of Removal</li> </ul> </li> <li>April 5, 2007 – <b>Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Motion for Reconsideration of the Court’s Order Relating to the Renewed Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Discovery</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 18, 2007 – State of Arizona’s Opposition to Warrick Pharmaceutical’s Motion for Reconsideration of the Order Regarding the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<b>United States ex rel. Edward West v. Ortho McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. et al., Case No. 1:03-8239</b>	n/a	N.D. Ill.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>December 20, 2006 – <b>Order of Transfer with Simultaneous Separation and Remand</b></li> <li>June 11, 2007 – <b>Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 9, 2007 – Plaintiff’s Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction</li> <li>July 23, 2007 - Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>State of Idaho v. Abbott Laboratories, Case No. 1:07-93</b>	n/a	D. Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May 2, 2007 – <b>Order Lifting Stay of Conditional Transfer Order (36)</b> transferring <i>State of Idaho v. Abbott Laboratories</i>, Case No. 1:07-93, to D. Mass</li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 30, 2007 - Objection of the States of Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina to the Court’s July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>The People of the State of Illinois v. Abbott Labs., Case No. 1:06-5528</b>	n/a	Removed to N.D. Ill.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>December 14, 2006 – <b>Order Lifting Stay of Conditional Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>The People of the State of Illinois v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>, N.D. Illinois, Case No. 1:06-5528 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 27, 2006 – Notice of Opposition to proposed transfer filed</li> <li>January 25, 2007 – JPML Hearing Session to Consider CTO 33 and Possible Final Transfer Order</li> </ul> </li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>March 12, 2007 – Response of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Florida Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notice</li> </ul> </li> <li>April 27, 2007 – <b>Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 30, 2007 - Objection of the States of Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina to the Court’s July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<b>Commonwealth of Kentucky ex rel. v. Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corp., et al., Case No. 3:06-69</b>	n/a	Removed to E.D. Ky.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January 19, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>Commonwealth of Kentucky ex rel. v. Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corp., et al.</i>, E.D. Ky., Case No. 3:06-69, to D. Mass.</li> <li>April 27, 2007 – <b>Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 30, 2007 - Objection of the States of Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina to the Court's July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>State of Mississippi v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:06-566</b>	n/a	Removed to S.D. Miss.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 28, 2006 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>State of Mississippi v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, S.D. Miss., Case No. 3:06-566, to D. Mass.</li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.'s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>March 12, 2007 – Response of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Florida Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants' Joinder in Dey, Inc.'s Removal Notice</li> </ul> </li> <li>April 27, 2007 – <b>Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 30, 2007 - Objection of the States of Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina to the Court's July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<b>State of Ohio v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 1:06-676</b>	n/a	Removed to S.D. Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 7, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>State of Ohio v. Dey, Inc., et al.</i>, S.D. Ohio, Case No. 1:06-676, to D. Mass.</li> <li>March 28, 2007 – <b>Motion of State of Ohio to Lift Stay</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 11, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Response to Motion of State of Ohio to Lift Stay</li> </ul> </li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b></li> <li>March 29, 2007 – <b>Notice of Pending Motion to Remand Case to State Court</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 31, 2007 – Submission of the State of Ohio Regarding the Court’s July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. TAP Pharmaceutical Products, Case No. 2:06-4514</b>	n/a	Removed to E.D. Pa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January 24, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, etc. v. Tap Pharmaceutical Products, Inc., et al.</i>, E.D. Pennsylvania, Case No. 2:06-4514 to D.Mass.</li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> </ul>
<b>State of South Carolina et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Case No. 3:06-2482</b>	n/a	D.S.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 25, 2006 – <b>Conditional Transfer Order (32)</b> transferring <i>State of South Carolina v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc.</i>, D. South Carolina, Case No. 3:06-2482, to D. Mass <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 27, 2006 - Notice of opposition to proposed transfer filed</li> </ul> </li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 30, 2007 - Objection of the States of Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina to the Court’s July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP, Case No. 3:06-2914	n/a	Removed to D.S.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 7, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP</i>, D. South Carolina, Case No. 3:06-2914, to D. Mass.</li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 30, 2007 - Objection of the States of Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina to the Court's July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP, Case No. 3:06-2925	n/a	Removed to D.S.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 7, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP</i>, D. South Carolina, Case No. 3:06-2925, to D. Mass.</li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>July 30, 2007 - Objection of the States of Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Carolina to the Court's July 26, 2007 Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
County of Schenectady v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 06-1239	n/a	Removed to N.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 7, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>County of Schenectady v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc.</i>, et al., N.D. New York, CA No. 06-1239, to D. Mass.</li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.'s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 4, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego and County of Schenectady to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants' Joinder in Dey, Inc.'s Removal Notices</li> </ul> </li> <li>March 20, 2007 – <b>Motion of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego, and County of Schenectady for a Hearing Regarding Their Motions to Remand</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<b>County of Oswego v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 06-1240</b>	n/a	Removed to N.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 7, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>County of Oswego v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, N.D. New York, CA No. 06-1240, to D. Mass.</li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 4, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego and County of Schenectady to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notices</li> </ul> </li> <li>March 20, 2007 – <b>Motion of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego, and County of Schenectady for a Hearing Regarding Their Motions to Remand</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution.</b></li> </ul>
<b>County of Erie v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 06-6505</b>	n/a	Removed to W.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>February 7, 2007 – <b>Final Transfer Order (33)</b> transferring <i>The County of Erie v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, W.D. New York, CA No. 06-6505, to D. Mass.</li> <li>March 6, 2007 – <b>Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 4, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego and County of Schenectady to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notices</li> </ul> </li> <li>March 20, 2007 – <b>Motion of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego, and County of Schenectady for a Hearing Regarding Their Motions to Remand</b></li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution.</b></li> </ul>
<b>The County of Orange v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 07-2777</b>	n/a	S.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 18, 2007 - <b>Conditional Transfer Order (38)</b> transferring <i>The County of Orange v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, Case No. 1:07-2777, to D. Mass.</li> <li>July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution</b></li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<b>Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS):</b> <b>City of New York</b> (S.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Albany</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Allegany</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Broome</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Cattaraugus</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Cayuga</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Chautauqua</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Chemung</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Chenango</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Columbia</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Cortland</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Dutchess</b> (S.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Essex</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Fulton</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Genesee</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Greene</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Herkimer</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Jefferson</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Lewis</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Madison</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Monroe</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Nassau</b> (E.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Niagara</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Oneida</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Onondaga</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Ontario</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Orleans</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Putnam</b> (S.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Rensselaer</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Rockland</b> (S.D.N.Y.) <b>County of St. Lawrence</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Saratoga</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Schuyler</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Seneca</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Steuben</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Suffolk</b> (E.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Tompkins</b> (N.D.N.Y.)	n/a	E.D.N.Y. N.D.N.Y. S.D.N.Y. W.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>March 30, 2005 – <b>County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery From the Schering-Plough Corporation <i>sub judice</i></b> (Magistrate Judge Bowler) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 6, 2005 – Schering Plough’s Opposition to County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery</li> </ul> </li> <li>March 3, 2006 – <b>Individual Memoranda of Each Defendant in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County</b> (<i>individual memoranda filed by Bayer Corp., Sanofi-Synthelabo, Forest Labs., Inc./Forest Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Amgen, Inc., Pfizer Defendants, TAP Pharmaceutical Prods., Inc., Biogen Idec Inc., Wyeth, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., EMD, Inc., Mylan Defendants, AstraZeneca Defendants, Endo Pharmaceuticals, Roche Defendants, Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., MedImmune, Inc., Merck &amp; Co., Inc., Sandoz Inc., Ben Venue Labs., Inc., Par Pharmaceuticals, Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 17, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Individual Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County</li> <li>April 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Individual Memoranda of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss Filed by Eli Lilly &amp; Co., Purdue Pharma LP, Chiron Corp.</li> <li>May 11, 2006 – Individual Reply Memoranda of Each Defendant in Further Support of Its Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County (<i>individual memoranda filed by Forest Labs., Inc./Forest Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Amgen Inc., Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Biogen Idec Inc., Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc., Eli Lilly and Co., Wyeth, The Roche Defendants, Merck &amp; Co., Bayer Corp., Pfizer Defendants, Sanofi-Synthelabo, Mylan Defendants, Boehringer Ingelheim, Ben Venue Labs., Inc., Purdue Pharma LP/Purdue Frederick Co./Purdue Pharma Co., AstraZeneca, EMD, Inc., Sandoz Inc., Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., MedImmune, Inc., Par Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i>)</li> <li>June 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Joint Sur-Reply in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Individual Motions to Dismiss</li> <li>September 19, 2006 – Notice of Filing of Brief of the Attorney General of the State of New York as Amicus Curiae</li> <li>October 12, 2006 – Defendants’ Response to the Brief of the Attorney General of the State of New York as Amicus Curiae and to Plaintiffs’ Post-Oral Argument Submissions</li> <li>November 1, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Notice of Supplemental Authority In Further Opposition to Merck’s Motion to Dismiss</li> <li>December 22, 2006 – Memorandum of Merck &amp; Co., Inc., in Response to Plaintiffs’ “Notice of Supplemental Authority In Opposition to Merck’s Motion to Dismiss” (leave to file granted on December 20, 2006)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<b>County of Ulster</b> (N.D.N.Y.), <b>County of Warren</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Washington</b> (N.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Wayne</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Westchester</b> (S.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Wyoming</b> (W.D.N.Y.) <b>County of Yates</b> (W.D.N.Y.)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ February 9, 2007 – Notice of Supplemental Authority in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and New York Counties Other than Nassau</li> <li>○ February 23, 2007 – Captioned Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Merck’s Motion for Leave to File Memorandum in Response to Plaintiffs’ “Notice of Supplemental Authority in Opposition to Merck’s Motion to Dismiss”</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Defendant Chiron Corporation’s Renewed Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated New York City and New York Counties First Amended Consolidated Complaint</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Eli Lilly and Company’s Renewed Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint on the Ground that It Previously was Dismissed from this Case Pursuant to the Court’s “Suffolk 13” Decision</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Ivax Corporation, Ivax Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Barr Laboratories, Inc.’s Joint Renewed Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint on the Ground that They were Previously Dismissed from this Case Pursuant to the Court’s “Suffolk 13” Decision</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Defendant Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc.’s Renewal of Its Individual Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff New York Counties Other than Nassau</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Amgen Inc.’s Renewed Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ Complaint</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Motion to Renew Individual Memorandum of Defendants Purdue Pharma L.P., Purdue Frederick Company and Purdue Pharma Company’s in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.’s Motion to Renew Supplemental Motion to Dismiss and Reassert Reply Memorandum to Plaintiffs’ Response to Motion to Dismiss</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Motion to Renew Separate Memorandum of Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss</li> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Defendant Bayer Corporation’s Notice of Its Renewal of Its Pending Individual Motion to Dismiss in Response to Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint</li> <li>○ June 25, 2007 – Defendant Wyeth’s Renewal of Its Motion to Dismiss the Complaint Filed by New York City and the New York Counties, Including Nassau County</li> <li>○ July 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Omnibus Memorandum in Opposition to the Individual Defendant’s Renewed Motions to Dismiss</li> <li>○ July 18, 2007 – Reply in Support of Motion to Renew Docket #2199 Separate Memorandum of Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation in Support of its Motion to Dismiss</li> </ul>

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p><b>Consolidated Counties Case (continued)</b></p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ July 18, 2007 – Defendant Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc.’s Reply in Support of its Renewal of its Individual Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff New York Counties Other than Nassau</li> <li>○ July 18, 2007 – Ivax Corporation, Ivax Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Barr Laboratories, Inc.’s Reply in Support of Joint Renewed Motion to Dismiss the Claims of Suffolk County in the New York Counties’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint on the Ground that They Were Previously Dismissed from the Case Pursuant to the Court’s “Suffolk 13” Decision</li> <li>○ July 18, 2007 - Defendant TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.’s Response to Plaintiffs’ Omnibus Memorandum in Opposition to the Individual Defendant’s Renewed Motion to Dismiss</li> <li>○ July 19, 2007 - Defendant Wyeth’s Response in Support of the Renewal of its Motion to Dismiss the Complaint Filed by New York City and the New York Counties, Including Nassau County</li> <li>○ July 24, 2007 - Plaintiffs’ Omnibus Sur-Reply to the Individual Defendant’s Renewed Motions to Dismiss</li> <li>• June 22, 2007 – <b>Defendants Joint Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ July 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint</li> <li>○ July 18, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Reply in Further Support of Their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint</li> <li>○ July 20, 2007 - Defendants’ Corrected Joint Reply in Further Support of their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint</li> <li>○ July 24, 2007 - Plaintiffs’ Sur-Reply Memorandum of Law in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Join Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint</li> </ul> </li> <li>• July 24, 2007 – <b>Order of Reference for Alternative Dispute Resolution.</b></li> </ul>

**MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – PRIVATE CLASS CASES**

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action	Master File 01-CV-12257-PBS	D. Mass. pursuant to JPML Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May 3, 2004 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period from Defendants Abbott Laboratories, AstraZeneca, Schering Plough, Sicor and Together Rx Defendants <i>sub judice</i></b> (Magistrate Judge Bowler) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May 17, 2004 – Certain Defendants’ Notice of Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Certain Documents and Consent Motion for an Extension of Time</li> <li>○ May 26, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Schering–Plough (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Schering-Plough</i>)</li> <li>○ May 27, 2004 – Consent Motion for an Extension of Time to Oppose the Motion to Compel</li> <li>○ May 27, 2004 – Opposition of the Together Rx Defendants to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents</li> <li>○ May 28, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Abbott Laboratories (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Abbott Laboratories</i>)</li> <li>○ June 8, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant AstraZeneca. (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to AstraZeneca</i>)</li> <li>○ June 9, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period from the Together Rx Defendants</li> <li>○ June 22, 2004 – Order granting Plaintiffs’ Motion to Withdraw Motion to Compel Directed at Abbott Laboratories</li> <li>○ Awaiting scheduling of hearing or ruling by Court as to Together Rx Defendants</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ February 23, 2005 – <b>Third Party Schaller Anderson Inc.’s Objection and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Subpoena</b></li> <li>• June 14, 2005 – <b>Defendant Sicor Inc. and Sicor Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order with Memorandum in Support <i>sub judice</i></b> (Magistrate Judge Bowler)</li> </ul>

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ June 28, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Sicor’s Motion for Protective Order</li> <li>○ July 7, 2005 – Motion for Leave to File Reply to Plaintiffs’ Response to Sicor’s Motion for Protective Order</li> <li>• November 9, 2005 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Motion for Order Exempting Defendant Abbott Laboratories from Any Order Refusing to Extend Deadline for Track Two Discovery</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ November 23, 2005 – Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Order Exempting Defendant Abbott Laboratories from Any Order Declining to Extend Deadline for Track Two Discovery</li> <li>○ December 1, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Letter to Magistrate Judge Bowler Requesting Postponement of Hearing until Track Two Discovery Issues Resolved</li> </ul> </li> <li>• November 28, 2005 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ November 30, 2005 – Response of Defendant Watson Pharma, Inc. to Plaintiffs’ “Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16”</li> <li>○ November 30, 2005 – Certain Track II Defendants’ Request for Expedited Hearing</li> <li>○ December 1, 2005 – Order re: Plaintiffs’ Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16</li> <li>○ December 9, 2005 – Track II Defendants’ Submission Regarding Discovery Schedule</li> <li>○ December 9, 2005 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule</li> <li>○ December 9, 2005 – Defendants Baxter Healthcare Corporation and Baxter International Inc.’s Memorandum Regarding Track II Discovery Schedule</li> <li>○ December 9, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Support of Their Proposed Track II Discovery Schedule</li> <li>○ December 15, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Reply to Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule</li> <li>○ December 16, 2005 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion for Leave to File Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• February 16, 2006 – <b>Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to the Order of Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Issued on February 4, 2006 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 72(a)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ February 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Assented-to Motion for Leave to Reply to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to the Order of Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Issued on February 4, 2006 to File Such Reply Until March 8, 2006</li> <li>○ March 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Denying Further Discovery of Massachusetts Health Plans</li> <li>○ March 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Denying Further Discovery of Massachusetts Health Plans</li> </ul> </li> <li>• February 21, 2006 – <b>UnitedHealthcare, Inc. and United HealthCare Insurance Co.’s Limited Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Compel</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ March 10, 2006 – Defendants’ Response to Third Party UnitedHealthcare, Inc. and United HealthCare Insurance Company’s Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Compel</li> </ul> </li> <li>• May 8, 2006 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Motion to Certify Claims with Respect to Track 2 Defendants</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May 16, 2006 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and a Proposed Class Representative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ May 19, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and Class Representative</li> <li>§ May 24, 2006 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corp.’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and Class Representative</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ May 16, 2006 – <b>Track Two Defendants’ Motion to Strike Harold Bean as a Proposed Class Representative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ May 26, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Strike Harold Bean as a Proposed Class Representative</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ June 15, 2006 – Defendants’ Individual Memoranda of Law in Opposition to Track 2 Class Certification (<i>individual memorandum</i>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p><i>filed by each of the Track 2 Defendants</i>) (Redacted versions filed in last week of June/first week of July 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ July 19, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Certify Claims With Respect to Track 2 Defendants</li> <li>○ August 4, 2006 – Track Two Proposal Concerning the Appointment of a Neutral Expert to Advise the Court on Track Two Class Certification</li> <li>○ August 7, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Track Two Proposal Concerning the Appointment of a Neutral Expert to Advise the Court on Track Two Class Certification</li> <li>○ August 25, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Memorandum in Opposition to Class Certification</li> <li>○ August 25, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Memorandum Regarding Harold Bean, in Further Opposition to Class Certification</li> <li>○ September 5, 2006 – Plaintiff’s Response to Track 2 Defendants’ Memorandum Regarding Harold Bean</li> <li>○ September 7, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Notice of Supplemental Evidence Relevant to Class Certification</li> <li>○ September 11, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Supplemental Filing Regarding the Track Two Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File the Rebuttal Declaration of Steven J. Young in Support of Track 2 Defendants’ Opposition to Class Certification or, in the Alternative, Motion to Strike the Hartman Track 2 Dyckman Rebuttal, Hartman Track 2 Young Rebuttal and the Rosenthal Rebuttal)</li> <li>○ September 11, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Notice of Supplemental Authority Relevant to Class Certification</li> <li>○ October 16, 2006 – Class Plaintiffs’ Submission of the “Generics Chart” Pursuant to the Oral Request of the Court During the Class Certification Hearing in Connection with Track 2 (corrected October 17, 2006)</li> <li>○ December 21, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Motion to Strike the “Generics Chart” and Proposed Track Two Class Certification Order Submitted by Plaintiffs’ in Support of Their Motion for Class Certification</li> <li>○ July 25, 2007 - Defendant Amgen Inc.’s Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Class Certification</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• June 22, 2006 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub Filed by Defendant Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation</b></li> </ul>

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ June 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Plaintiffs’ Memorandum and Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Steve W. Berman in Support of Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub Filed by Defendant Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation</li> <li>○ July 6, 2006 – Warrick’s Memorandum in Opposition to Certain Plaintiffs’ Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub and in Support of Cross Motion for Leave to Take Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony</li> <li>○ July 20, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Cross-Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony</li> <li>○ August 3, 2006 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Cross Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony</li> <li>• October 3, 2006 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ October 9, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Amended Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006</li> <li>○ October 11, 2006 – Corrected Plaintiffs’ Amended Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006</li> <li>○ October 17, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Objections to Plaintiffs’ Proposed Exhibits</li> <li>○ October 27, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006</li> <li>○ November 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006</li> <li>○ November 3, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Revised and Supplemental Objections to Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Proposed Exhibits</li> <li>○ December 5, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006 as to Exhibits</li> <li>○ December 15, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Second Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006 as to Exhibits</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• October 10, 2006 – <b>Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) – Exhibit List</b> (<i>individual lists filed by AstraZeneca, BMS, Johnson &amp; Johnson, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ October 17, 2006 – Defendants Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. and Oncology Therapeutics Network Corp.’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures</li> <li>○ October 19, 2006 – Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ October 23, 2006 – The J&amp;J Defendants’ Amended Individual Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ October 24, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) – Amended Exhibit List</li> <li>○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Exhibit List</li> <li>○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendant AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP’s Exhibit List</li> <li>○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendants Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. and Oncology Therapeutics Network Corp.’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures</li> <li>○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to the J&amp;J Defendants’ Amended Individual Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ October 25, 2006 – Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Second Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ November 2, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Second Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ November 3, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ November 6, 2006 – Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</li> <li>○ November 19, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Second Joint Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>26(a)(3)(A) as to Exhibits               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ December 20, 2006 – Schering’s and Warrick’s Supplemental List of Trial Exhibits</li> <li>○ January 11, 2007 – Schering’s and Warrick’s Second Supplemental List of Trial Exhibits</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• November 2, 2006 – <b>Defendant Immunex Corporation’s Objections to October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Regarding Immunex’s Motion for Protective Order Regarding May 17, 2006, Deposition Notice</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ November 9, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum In Response to Immunex Corporation’s Objections to October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Denying Immunex’s Motion for Protective Order</li> </ul> </li> <li>• November 6, 2006 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Objections to the October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Bowler Re: Amgen Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order Relating to Plaintiffs’ Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice Regarding Sales and Marketing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ November 14, 2006 – Amgen Inc.’s Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s October 23, 2006 Order Granting Amgen Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order</li> </ul> </li> <li>• December 19, 2006 – <b>Track 1 Defendants’ Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ December 26, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Track 1 Defendants’ December 19<sup>th</sup> Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</li> <li>○ January 12, 2007 – Track 1 Defendants’ (1) Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendants’ December 19<sup>th</sup> Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits and (2) Opposition to Plaintiffs’ January 4<sup>th</sup> Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</li> <li>○ January 19, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Objections to Track 1 Defendants’ December 19<sup>th</sup> Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</li> <li>○ June 28, 2007 – Order by Judge Saris Granting Admission of Trial Exhibit 2001 and Denying Admission of Trial Exhibits 1081, 1656, 2969, 2970 and 2971</li> </ul> </li> <li>• January 4, 2007 – <b>Plaintiffs’ Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ January 12, 2007 – Track 1 Defendants’ (1) Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendants’ December 19<sup>th</sup> Request for Admission of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>Trial Exhibits and (2) Opposition to Plaintiffs' January 4<sup>th</sup> Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ January 19, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Supplemental Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</li> <li>○ January 26, 2007 – Track 1 Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</li> <li>○ February 1, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Supplemental Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits</li> <li>○ June 28, 2007 – Order by Judge Saris Granting Admission of Trial Exhibits 15, 17, 19, 43, 47, 255, 256, 330, 409, 421, 422, 425, 433, 441, 453, 455, 466, 471, 503, 504, 523, 612, 709, 866, 953, 954, 955, 956 and 4109 and Denying Admission of Trial Exhibits 257, 258, 381, 469, 470, 478, 497, 501, 502, 559, 572, 618, 913 and 915</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• February 22, 2007 – <b>Plaintiffs' Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories' Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Third Party Subpoenas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ March 8, 2007 - Abbott Laboratories Response to Plaintiffs' Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories' Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Third Party Subpoenas</li> <li>○ March 23, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Reply Brief in Support of Their Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories' Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Third Party Subpoenas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• March 22, 2007 - <b>Declaration of G. Raymond Pironti, Jr. Regarding Time Expended for Preparing Direct Testimony via Declaration and Traveling from Tampa, Florida to Boston Pursuant to Subpoena to Appear for Trial Testimony and Request for Reimbursement</b></li> <li>• April 26, 2007 – <b>Class Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May 10, 2007 – Track Two Defendants' Opposition to Class Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File An Amended Complaint</li> <li>○ May 10, 2007 – BMS Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Fifth Amended Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint</li> <li>○ June 12, 2007 – Class Plaintiffs' Corrected Reply Memorandum in</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>Support of Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May 21, 2007 – <b>Renewed Motion for Amendment of Case Management Order No. 1 and Consolidated Order Re: Motion for Class Certification</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ June 6, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs’ Court Appointed Co-Lead Counsel to Renewed Motion for Amended Case Management Order No. 1</li> </ul> </li> <li>• June 22, 2007 – <b>Class Counsel’s Petition for Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Compensation to the Name Plaintiffs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ June 22, 2007 – Heins Mills &amp; Olson, P.L.C.’s Petition for Attorney Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses</li> <li>○ June 29, 2007 – Response of the Class 1 Class Representative, Reverend David Aaronson, to the Recommendation of Class Counsel Respecting Compensation to Named Plaintiffs</li> <li>○ June 29, 2007 – Motion to File Under Seal Exhibit A to Declaration of Donald E. Haviland, Jr. in Support of the Haviland Law Firm, LLC’s Petition for Attorneys’ Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses in Relation to Settlement with GlaxoSmithKline</li> <li>○ June 29, 2007 – Memorandum in Support of the Haviland Law Firm, LLC’s Petition for an Award of Attorney Fees and Expenses Out of the Proceeds of the GlaxoSmithKline Settlement</li> <li>○ July 27, 2007 - Co-Lead Counsel’s Motion for Order Authorizing Compensation to Consumer and Third-Party Payor Class Representatives from Fund Established in Connection with Plaintiffs’ Settlement With Defendant GlaxoSmithKline</li> </ul> </li> <li>• July 11, 2007 – <b>Non Party Cardinal Health’s Motion to Protect Confidential Proprietary Commercial Information</b></li> <li>• July 13, 2007 – <b>Notice of Submission to Court of Declaration and Request for Determination of Proprietary Filing Under Seal</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ July 27, 2007 – Class Counsel’s Response to the Declaration of Donald E. Haviland, Jr. In Response to Court Directive Concerning AstraZeneca Settlement</li> </ul> </li> </ul>